DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 441 UD 016 797

AUTHOR Toledo, Victor
TITLE Summer Reading Remediation for Incoming Pupils 1975; High School Umbrella Number 2, School Year 1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 14p.; Not available in hard copy due to the print quality of the original document; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61618 (a)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cocurricular Activities; Compensatory Education Programs; *Dropout Prevention; Grade 9; Grade 10; Individualized Instruction; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Reading; *Secondary Education; Student Interests; *Summer Programs; *Transitional Classes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I program, Summer Reading Remediation for Incoming Pupils 1975, had two goals: to improve reading skills by supplying an intensive program of remediation in reading and to orient incoming students to their new school environment and its staff. Participating in the program were 2807 ninth and tenth grade students. They were both pre and post tested. All student participants were selected from Title I intermediate and junior high schools. They were identified as retarded in reading. They were volunteers. The program consisted of one 50 minute period per day, five days a week. Reading skills were also stressed during a daily reinforcing activities period (metal shop, typing, drafting, etc). Statistical analysis of gain scores as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test showed that students who were in the program for a maximum of 14 instruction days made significant gains, on the average, over one month's improvement. Some reasons for the large gains obtained were: the small class size (no more than 15 students per instructor), the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to reading remediation employed, the availability of a wide range of materials, and the fact that remediation in reading comprehension and vocabulary skills was integrated into other class activities (metal shop, typing, drafting, etc.). (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137441

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-61618(a)

SUMMER READING REMEDIATION FOR INCOMING PUPILS 1975

HIGH SCHOOL UMBRELLA # 2

School Year 1975

Prepared By

Victor Toledo

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VD016797

An evaluation of a New York City School District educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for Summer 1975

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Cahpter I: The Program

The Reading component of the Summer Remediation Program for Incoming Pupils 1975 High School Umbrella # 2 was conducted in 25 high schools and included 3496 ninth and tenth grade student participants who attended at least one day of the program and were pretested. Of these, 2807 were both pre and post tested and are included as the subjects in the main body of this repost. Eighty-one reading teachers participated in the program as well as 58 Teaching Assistants and 40 student Aides.

All student participants were selected from Title I intermediate and Title I junior high schools and were considered to be educationally retarded inreading one or more years below their grade placement as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) as well as other standardized tests administered during the regular school year. Since student participants were volunteers, programs for recruitment were developed which included mailings, telephone calls to the students' homes, guidance conferences in the sending and receiving schools, and so on.

There were two major program goals:

1) To improve reading skills by supplying an intensive program of remediation in r ading so as to help overcome learning difficulties and help bridge the gap in changing schools.

2) To orient incoming students to the new school environment and its staff, thereby improving chances of student success and preventing premature dropping out.

The program consisted of one fifty-minute period per day, five days per week for four weeks commencing Juky 7, 1975 and terminating August 1, 1975. In addition, reading skills (vocabulary building, comprehending instructions,

etc.) were stressed during a daily reinforcing activities period (metal shop, typing, drafting, etc.). All students were pretested using the Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension subtests of the MAT. In addition to producing a grade equivalent (GE), the MAT was used as a diagnostic tool from which individual student profiles were developed. Teachers used these profiles to identify and stress remediation in areas of major deficiency.

Students were encouraged to follow their progress in remediated areas and were supplied with graphed progress sheets for this purpose. The progress sheets, along with test answer sheets and other program materials, were kept in individual folders which the students received at the beginning of each period and returned at the end.

A wide range of published reading materials was available and used. Additionally, word games and puzzles were used to stimulate interest and many teachers had paperback lending libraries in their rooms. In some instances, the school library was open and was used to recommend and make available reading materials as well as to teach reading in an informal atmosphere.

Chapter II: Evaluation Procedures

Program Objective # 1: To help pupils in the Remedial Reading Program to achieve statistically significant growth in their reading grades as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading.

All students were pretested using the Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension subtests of the MAT (Intermediate Level, Form H), during the first two days of the program (July 7th and 8th) and all students who completed the program (n=2728) were posttested on July 29th with the Word Knowledge and

Reading Comprehension subtests of the MAT (Intermediate Level, Form G). This allowed for fourteen treatment days. Teachers administered the pre and post tests in the classrooms.

Data were collected for 3496 students. Of these, 584 left the program before its completion while 105 were absent for the posttest and were omitted from all analyses. In addition, grade information was incorrectly reported for 37 student participants and was lacking for 42 others. The resulting analyses were computed using the maximum number of participants possible, i.e., 2728.

Evaluation Objective # 1 was investigated by applying the correlated t-test technique to determine if the difference between pre/post test grade equivalent means were statistically significant.

Chapter III: Findings

Evaluation Objective # 1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Remedial Reading Program, the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores when a correlated t-test is applied.

The results of the pre and post testing are shown in Table I. The mean pretest reading level in grade equivalent units was found to be 6.068. The mean posttest reading level in grade equivalent units was 6.185 (see Table I). The mean gain for 2728 students with pre/post test data available was 1.10 months (see Table I). A correlated t-test was applied and a t value of 5.500 was obtained with a significance level beyond .001 ($p \leq .001$, see Table I). When the data are examined by grade, we find that 1794 ninth grade students showed a mean gain of 1.114 months and 934 tenth grade students showed a mean

gain of 1.05 months (see Table I). The discrepancy between the total N and the combined ninth and tenth grade N_s is due to inaccurate reporting of student grade placement information (37 out-of-range grade placements and 42 lack of grade placements).

Ten schools were visited and 28 classes observed and their teachers interviewed. Although a formal interview schedule was not used, the questions asked consistently concerned the sufficiency of materials, student motivation, range of student scores, adequacy of facilities, use of student profiles, student grouping for instruction, and so on.

In all cases but one, teachers responded that the available materials were more than adequate and serviced the wide range of students' remedial needs. Most classes were below the maximum class size of 15 students allowing for extensive individual teaching. The small class size and wide range of reading scores made grouping unreasonable in most classes. In some schools, where classes were assigned after testing, students were pre grouped by reading level and teachers were able to conduct short lecture periods followed by small-group instruction.

Educational Assistants and Student Aides were available in an uncertain pattern. Where Educational Assistants were available and grouping was possible, the Educational Assistants seemed to be most effectively employed. In most instances, good working relationships between teachers and supportive personnel were observed. Some teachers, unaccustomed to assessing the skills of paraprofessionals and student assistants or with little experience assigning work responsibilities, under utilized the available supportive personnel.

The evaluator found materials and facilities more than adequate for program needs generally. In one school facilities were extremely poor and student attendance and attrition reflected this condition (39 Of 98 students completed the program).

The implemented program coincided with the project description that appeared in the proposal and serviced the target population, i.e., students who were retarded in reading by one or more years below grade level.

In both discussions with teachers and findings from a questionnaire, the evaluator received recommendations for giving credit for the Summer Reading Remediation Program. On the open-ended section of 126 teacher questionnaires (see Summer Remediation for Incoming Students - Bilingual Component prepared by Marietta Shore, Function # 09-616180, eighteen respondents recommended that some form of credit be given to students completing the program.

Chapter IV: Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Pre/post reading scores were examined and showed a mean gain of 1.10 months, significant beyond the .001 level ($p \leq .001$). Considering the large mean gain shown for the total population and the short treatment period (14 days), the program can be considered highly successful and is recommended for refunding.

The following recommendations are based on program data, conversations with teachers, paraprofessionals and students, evaluator program observations, and returned questionnaire data.

1) Increase the length of the program to six weeks.

2) Supply lunch or afternoon activities for program participants to improve program retention and attendance.

3) Award credit ($\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 credit) to student who complete the program.

4) Group students by reading grade level or by specific remedial needs when possible.

5) Test Supportive personnel for skills levels to better utilize their abilities.

6) Train program teachers (half-day program) in skills assessment to maximize use of supportive personnel.

Table I

PRETEST, POSTTEST AND GAIN DATA BY GRADE

	Pretest Mean	S.D.	Posttest Mean	S.D.	Mean Gain	N
Grade 9	5.978	1.826	6.092	1.741	.114	1794
Grade 10	6.282	2.055	6.387	1.957	.105	934
Combined 9 and 10	6.082		6.192		*.110	2728
Out-of-Grade	5.540		5.873		.333	37
No Grade	7.075		6.388		.313	42
Total Total	6.068	1.922	6.185	1.836	.117	2808

*A correlated t-test was applied and a t value of 5.500 was obtained with a $p \leq .001$

SUMMER READING REMEDIATION FOR INCOMING PUPILS 1975
HIGH SCHOOL UMBRELLA # 2

Function # 09-61618 (a)

Use Table 28 for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 26. (See "Instructions" Item 5 before completing this table.)

28. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. 27

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested		Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data		Subgroup 9/
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post			4/ N	5/	Date	Mean	6/ SD	Date	Mean	6/ SD	7/ Test	8/ Value	
6 0 8 1 5	7 2 2	MAT/70	H	G	Int	Int	2299	Grade9	1794	1	7/8	5.98	1.8	7/29	6.09	1.7	corr. t test	5.816	
6 0 8 1 6	7 2 2	MAT/70	H	G	Int	Int	1197	Grd 10	934	1	7/8	6.28	2.1	7/29	6.39	1.96	corr. t test	3.50	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ SD = Standard Deviation
7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value
9/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

10

11

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-61618 (a)

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 5/6	7 2 2	15/6	MAT/70	3496	2728	768	28%	Left the program before completion	584
								Absent from the posttest	105
								Grade information incorrectly reported	37
								Grade information Lacking	42

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

12

13

3/75

Summary

The major objective of the Summer Reading Remediation for Incoming Pupils, 1975 High School Program was to achieve statistically significant growth in reading as measured by the MAT in Reading. Students, who were in the program for a maximum of fourteen instructional days, showed the following mean gains by grade; 9th grade students gained 1.14 months and 10th grade students gained 1.05 months. The combined (9th and 10th grades) mean gain was 1.10 months. All gains were significant beyond the .001 level.

Some reasons for the large gains obtained are:

a) The small class size (15 or less students per instructor).

b) The diagnostic - prescriptive approach to reading remediation employed.

c) The availability of a wide range of materials.

d) Remediation in reading comprehension and vocabulary skills was part of other class activities (metal shop, typing, drafting, etc.).

The pedagogical procedures employed, designed to strengthen those areas in need of the most remediation, added to the positive results. These consisted of highly individualized program approaches to students' reading problems. Teachers employed whichever measures seemed most appropriate, based on both formal diagnostic procedures as well as their teaching experiences in the areas of reading remediation. These included, among others, class lectures, small-group workshops with teachers, educational assistants and peers, individualized program development, word games tied to reading programs, self-paced program materials, and so on. All students were responsible for maintaining class folders in which were kept, in addition to test materials, self-scoring progress sheets. These progress sheets tended to increase students' motivation for improvement.